

THESE ARE B-B EXPORTED—AMERICAN PETROLEUM  
INSTITUTE, ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

Date	Distillate <sup>1</sup>
January 1998	133
February 1998	79
March 1998	129
April 1998	186
May 1998	121
June 1998	149
July 1998	161
August 1998	150
September 1998	107
October 1998	75
November 1998	54
December 1998	145
January 1999	117
February 1999	116
March 1999	159
April 1999	191
May 1999	187
June 1999	180
July 1999	123
August 1999	130
September 1999	162
October 1999	192
November 1999	170
December 1999	212
January 2000	132
February 2000	112
March 2000	211
April 2000	178
May 2000	127
June 2000	149
July 2000	132
August 2000	168

<sup>1</sup> Distillate fuel exports (Mbbl), heating oil and diesel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand I have up to 20 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I understand Senator SESSIONS would like to follow me with 5 minutes, if there is no objection.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from New Mexico wishes to speak for how long?

Mr. DOMENICI. Up to 20 minutes.

Mr. REID. We have the Senator from Alabama, and we have Senator BRYAN who wishes 10 minutes. I ask that, using normal procedure, we have a Republican and a Democrat. I ask that Senator BRYAN be the last speaker for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I assume we need Senator SESSIONS' concurrence.

Mr. SESSIONS. That is all right with me. I respect that. Senator BRYAN will be the last. I defer to him.

Will the Senator restate the agreement? The Senator from New Mexico has 20 minutes, Senator BRYAN has 10 minutes, and I have 5 minutes.

Mr. REID. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

## TAX RELIEF PROPOSALS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I put a little editorial up here, and I hope I made it big enough that those who photograph what we talk about here can see it.

I want to read this paragraph in yellow, and I want to speak to Vice President GORE's constant harping about the 1 percent of the American taxpayers getting too much of a tax break. I would like to do that for about 10 or 12 minutes.

But first, let me suggest to the middle-class American people who have been waiting for a tax cut that if you elect Vice President GORE, you can wait perhaps forever because, as this editorial says, he might say over and over and over—maybe as many times as he said "1 percent" the other night—that he is for middle-income Americans getting a tax break.

But this is the Washington Post—not the Washington Times or the Albuquerque Journal—that says:

If Mr. Gore believes middle-class people need a tax break, he might better give them one—and let them decide how to spend the money. If he believes the Government should do more to promote education, he could do so more effectively with truly targeted spending programs rather than with tax credits that, for example, go to those who could and would pay for tuition in any case along with those who need the help. But for political reasons, the Democrats, as in 1992 and 1996, believe they need to cloak their programs in the language and form of tax cuts. One result would be an ever more complex Tax Code.

The truth of the matter is that the Vice President of the United States spoke the other night about the unfairness of the tax proposals of George W. Bush.

I just want to start by correcting one thing for sure. There are no middle-income tax cuts in Vice President GORE's proposal—the last time he spoke to it, the second time he spoke to it, and the time he sent us an 81-page budget. There are no middle-class tax cuts. Why? Because he chooses to say to the American people: If you do this with your money, you get a credit; if you do that with your money, you get a credit.

But for those who do not do this or that because they don't have any children to put in day care or they don't have any of the other things they need that he wants to give them tax credit for, the overwhelming percentage of the middle class gets zero.

That is maybe what we ought to be talking about whenever he says 1 percent. Perhaps we ought to say middle-class people, zero; middle-class Americans, zero—maybe 16 times, as he did the other night in referring to "1 percent."

Having said that, I want to talk about the progressive taxes the American people pay and the progressive system we live under because I believe there are millions and millions of Americans who have not been told what our Tax Code is and have not been told what George W. Bush's tax proposals would do. Let me try that for a few minutes.

I just told you what the Washington Post said about his tax proposals. In

essence, even when he chooses to help—that is, the Vice President—the middle-class Americans, he chooses, I say to my friend from Alabama, to tell them how to spend the tax cut.

That is the essence of the difference between the across-the-board cut of George W. Bush and the Vice President, although he has much less on the tax side, in any event—the Vice President—but he chooses to say: Mr. and Mrs. America, I don't want you to have a \$1,500 tax cut if you are making \$60,000 or \$50,000. What I want you to do, if you want to take advantage of what I want you to do, if you do one of these five or six things as we have said, you will get a tax break.

If you are Mr. and Mrs. America, you might say: I don't need any of those taxes. Why don't you just give me my money and let me spend it?

That is one of the very big differences between the two parties at this point, as indicated by this editorial.

In 1992 and 1996, Vice President GORE again chose in behalf of his colleagues to say: We want to give you a tax cut, but do not misunderstand; you have to use it our way or you don't get it.

Is there anybody in America who thinks a tax cut should be used only the way the Federal Government wants them to use it? I don't think they even understand a tax cut to be that. But you can rest on it, that is what he is talking about—not a single middle-income tax cut—zero. I repeat.

I would like to talk a little bit on what has happened to the Tax Code of the United States.

Mr. President and fellow Senators, we have the fairest and most progressive Tax Code any country has ever lived under. Let me tell you what it does today.

If anyone wants one of these, I will gladly give them one. The Internal Revenue Service gives us the information, and the Joint Committee on Taxation, which is a combined committee, gave us this information.

Let me talk about the 1 percent.

Fellow Americans, 1 percent of the taxpayers of America—1 percent—currently pay a shocking 33 percent of the taxes.

Let me repeat, Mr. President. On the income tax side, the top 1 percent of Americans pay 33 percent of the taxes that America collects from income. They are rather wealthy. They make \$250,000 and over, and 1 percent pays 33 percent of the taxes.

Let me right off the bat give you an astonishing number. If you are to adopt George W. Bush's across-the-board tax cut, guess what percent the top 1 percent will pay then? Remember I said, right now under our very progressive code, they pay 33 percent of all the taxes we collect.

I say to my friend from Alabama, it is a startling revelation. After we cut

everybody across the board, as George Bush suggests, the top 1 percent will pay 34 percent total taxes. In other words, their portion of the total taxes will go up 1 percent, not come down. Isn't that interesting?

So everyone understands who is rich and who isn't and who pays a lot of taxes and who doesn't, let's talk about the top 10 percent of taxpayers. Most people watching and most people visiting are in that bracket because the top 10 percent of the taxpayers are people earning \$79,000 or higher. How much of the total taxes collected by America from income does the top 10 percent pay? I am sure, unless someone has studied it, in your wildest guess you will not conclude this. Sixty-seven percent of the income taxes collected come from the top 10 percent of the people in this country who are earning \$79,000. Imagine.

Can anyone imagine a fairer system if you want to tax people who earn money than to have 1 percent of the population that makes substantial money pay 33 percent of the taxes, and the top 10 percent of 79 and higher pay 67 percent? Frankly, it is obvious to me our Vice President is, once again, running on an issue that has been tried before, and we are very grateful as a nation that it has never worked. He is practicing the art of class warfare. He wants to make sure Americans do not trust the capitalist system where people might make more money, one versus another, depending on what they are doing, what they have invested in, and for what they have taken a risk. He wants to make the issue that the top 10 percent, which pays 33 percent of the taxes, does not deserve to be looked at when we look at cutting taxes for Americans.

I am quite sure that sooner or later the American people are going to catch on that everybody who pays taxes gets a tax break. So nobody will have a misunderstanding, if you don't pay taxes, you don't get a tax break. I think that is pretty fundamental. There are many millions of Americans working for a living who do not pay any U.S. income tax. Right off the bat, when you speak about giving other people who are earning less tax breaks, we have to understand a very large percentage of Americans don't pay any taxes. They may think they are paying a lot because they are paying Social Security taxes, and neither candidate is recommending, from what I can tell, that we dramatically reduce the Social Security—other than George W. Bush saying let's investment 2 percent. Otherwise, I haven't heard anybody saying that onerous Social Security tax is the one that ought to be fixed.

Let me repeat, when the tax plan is in place under Mr. Bush, the top 1 percent will pay \$4 trillion in taxes when we have finished the tax across-the-board cut. Let's give that again: That

top 1 percent will pay \$4 trillion in income taxes, and it will be 34 percent of the new income taxes that we are taking in.

What will that \$4 trillion buy that 1 percent of Americans are paying in taxes? It will buy all of the following: All of our defense programs, welfare, food stamps, child nutrition, State child health insurance. We just picked some programs. That top 1 percent will pay for all of that out of what they pay in income taxes.

If Mr. GORE continues to refer to this top 1 percent as public enemy No. 1, then I can only say that the top 1 percent are high-income folks; the top 10 percent earn \$79,000 and above. One group pays 33 percent of the taxes; and the other group pays 67.

What should we do? Should we say because they pay 67 percent of the taxes but they make \$79,000 or more they should get no tax reduction? If you are going to have a tax reduction because you have a giant surplus, let's be fair and say the American Tax Code is fair. We ought to continue to be fair, leave it as fair as it was, but make sure we understand the top 10 percent deserve some tax relief, since they are paying 67 percent of the tax.

Let me also suggest that the bottom rung of wage earners and taxpayers in America—so there is no misunderstanding about my progressivity comment that we have a progressive code—the bottom 50 percent pay 4 percent; the bottom 50 percent of our earners pay 4 percent of the taxes of America.

I think we have a pretty fair system. In fact, it is very heavily skewed towards those people making \$79,000 or more. But George Bush, from what I can analyze, intends to leave it the same. It will come out like it is in terms of progressivity, excepting that those in the top 1 percent, by a coincidence of reducing the total tax take, will end up paying 34 percent instead of 33—even if we give them a tax break.

I do believe it is rather authentic when the Washington Post says to Vice President GORE, if you want to give the middle income a tax cut, give it to them. Don't tell them what they must use it for in order to get a tax credit or tax break. That is not very American. Why should the Government tell wage earners, people who are making money in the American system, what they must do with their income if they want a tax break? I thought if you were going to give it back, you would give it back to them so they can spend it.

I will discuss another issue, Mr. Vice President. I don't come today to the floor to talk about the case of the schoolgirl in Florida who had to stand for one of her first days of classes this fall because \$150,000 worth of computers had yet to be unboxed. That is one of the statements made by our Vice President in his debate. It is now, today, authentic, that is not a true

statement. The people from that school and that school district have denied it. I think by this hour the Gore campaign has said it is a mistake.

The Vice President said essentially in his own words that the analysis of his budget from the budget experts who work for this Senator, the chairman of the Budget Committee, although they happen to work for me, what they produced as the estimate of the cost of his budget ideas would use up the entire surplus and \$700 to \$900 billion of the Social Security surplus. He said something like, it is not worth the paper.

I have analyzed with this same staff many budgets. They have come out as right as anyone around. They said before the Vice President put his entire package together, that if every single program he advocates would get funded—it is 200 or more new programs—there will be between 20,000 and 30,000 new Federal employees.

Incidentally, when the Vice President takes great credit for shrinking the Government and says we have reduced the number of people working for the Government, it would be good to note that 90 percent of the shrinkage of Federal employees is because the military was reduced. Between 85 and 90 percent of that entire personnel reduction is from military reductions.

But let's get back to this. That budget staff said there are 200 new programs in the Vice President's ideas for America. They also suggested to me it is a new era of big government, excessive government, and obviously huge increases in what government will do.

I laid that before the Senate in this report. It is as correct today as it was then. And, indeed, we have now seen Vice President GORE's plan all in one package. They reanalyzed it and said their original estimate is right, that he would have to spend the surplus to pay for his entire budget. We will have that report next week in an edition similar to this one, in which each program is analyzed and we tell the American people either the Vice President is suggesting myriad programs he does not intend to do or intends to do less than he said because if he is going to do what he says in his last written proposal, you cannot do those programs without spending all of the surplus and part of—not all of it but part of the surplus that belongs to Social Security.

I close by saying the Vice President Tuesday night talked a lot about the lockbox. Isn't it amazing that Democrats, including the Vice President, talk about the lockbox as if they invented it; they pursued it; they are the ones who really advocated it and kept it alive. I want to say this is one time when Senator DOMENICI has to say: That is not true. It came out of the Budget Committee and I was the first Senator to suggest it. The proposal I suggested has never been voted on to

this date because it is a real lockbox. It really makes it tough to spend either Social Security—and if you want to use the same format for Medicare, that is fine. But let's get it straight. We have been trying to get a lockbox passed up here from our side. Whatever we propose is either too strict, too rigid, doesn't have enough flexibility for the Treasury Department, or something. But let's make sure everybody understands we started the idea; we pursued it with great vigor. It is now part, I believe, of what we believe. Whether we get it passed or not, in our form, I believe everybody around here is going to be frightened to death if a Budget Committee says: Hey, this budget is spending Social Security surplus money. I believe we have that ingrained in our minds because the public expects it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before the Senator from Nevada takes the floor, I ask unanimous consent following the Senator from Alabama, Senator DURBIN be recognized for a half hour in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post features an article entitled "Iverson's Bad Rap Is Well-Deserved."

It is a story about one of the Nation's high-profile National Basketball Association stars who is about to release a rap CD that encourages gun violence, degrades women, and blatantly bashes people because of their sexual orientation. The National Basketball Association, the Philadelphia 76ers, his team, Mr. Iverson's record label, his coach, and every fairminded person should condemn this kind of so-called entertainment for the trash that it is. Clearly, these are not the kind of messages that one of the NBA's leading and most talented players should be sending to tens of thousands of kids who watch him play and may idolize him.

I fully respect Mr. Iverson's first amendment rights, but clearly the message he is sending encourages violence and implicitly condones it, hardly the kind of conduct one would expect from a celebrity whose conduct is admired by many of the Nation's youth.

What makes this particularly objectionable is the fact that Mr. Iverson and many of his other incredibly talented colleagues in the NBA are specifically marketed by the NBA itself as superheroes to our kids. The NBA is ultimately in a business to make money, and that is fine. They use their stars to promote their teams. But one would hope the NBA would exercise good judgment in choosing the athletes they select to promote because many of these athletes use their stardom to,

again, promote themselves and to use that same kind of marketing appeal. And when the message, as in this case from Mr. Iverson, is both hateful and dangerous and is absorbed by all too many of our Nation's youth, it is a vicious cycle that the NBA should end immediately.

The NBA has the power to pick and choose which athletes they are going to market and promote. They should exercise sound judgment and discretion before encouraging this kind of promotion and the reprehensible message it sends.

A few weeks ago I joined with many of our colleagues, both in committee and on the floor, in condemning some of the media produced in Hollywood, some of the videos, some of the violence that so often invades the Nation's television audience. We should also condemn this kind of conduct as well. When the NBA promotes these questionable athletes, they assist them in their quest to become wealthy media darlings, and that only helps other media outlets such as record companies and movie studios to exploit their now already famous personalities. In fact, Mr. Iverson's record company is apparently planning to use the NBA's very well publicized All-Star weekend to release the uncensored—and one could only conclude even more objectionable—version of his soon-to-be-released CD.

Again, it is ultimately going to have to be up to the NBA as to who they promote and market and who they do not. But they need to realize if they continue to promote and market athletes who use their league-endorsed celebrity to promote or incite violence or the degradation of more than half the Nation's population, they will continue to bear a great deal of responsibility for the consequences of these actions.

I find it somewhat incredible that the Philadelphia 76ers' own coach has said, according to the Washington Post article, that he does not have a problem with Mr. Iverson's CD. That is nothing more than a cheap copout, and the NBA, the Philadelphia 76ers, and his coach should immediately condemn this outrageous, dangerous, and hateful message.

Let me give an example of one of the lyrics that is on this CD. Mr. Iverson says on his CD if someone is "man enough to pull a gun/Be man enough to squeeze it."

In addition, he also advocates the murder of gay men on his new CD.

I am told that a wire report has been circulated this afternoon indicating that Mr. Iverson has apologized to gay men and to women for the hateful language contained in his CD. I call upon Mr. Iverson to do more than that; to ask, as a responsible American, as a role model, which he styles himself to be: Let's not issue this CD. Let's recall it. That would be the kind of conduct

we should ask and expect of Mr. Iverson.

There are many athletes in America who do provide the kind of role model all Americans can endorse—the Cal Ripkens and the Tiger Woods in the World. These are the kind of people who send a very positive message about the value of the work ethic and the commitment to standards. All of us admire that kind of conduct. If Mr. Iverson is deemed to be a role model for America's youth, I suggest that the youth of America is in serious trouble.

Michael Wilbon also had a very interesting response to this subject in the Post this morning. I commend it to my colleagues as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### IVERSON'S BAD RAP IS WELL-DESERVED

(By Michael Wilbon)

Like a lot of other folks who care about basketball, I keep waiting for Allen Iverson to grow up. I keep waiting for him to lift some weights and get stronger so that he can better withstand the pounding he takes. I keep waiting, hoping for him to realize that games are often won at the previous day's practice, which he may or may not have attended. I keep hoping that he is old enough now—25—to understand there's a world of difference between being a great talent and a great player, between somebody who's got game and a champion. I keep waiting for Iverson to understand that the notion of being a role model goes way beyond a lot of people walking around town wearing your jersey.

But here we are, at the start of NBA season No. 5, and Iverson seems no closer to getting any of this than he did four years ago. Maybe he's further away. My vigil appears to be in vain.

NBA camps have just opened, and Iverson is in the news already, again for the wrong reasons. The story with sizzle is the controversy over a soon-to-be-released rap CD on which Iverson does what the majority of thug rappers do: He demonstrates that he, too, can bash gays, degrade women and talk about shooting somebody. That's the genre. It's pretty clear how this breaks down; if you're under 30 (regardless of race, nationality, gender), chances are overwhelming you're a lot more open to thug rap than if you're over 40. I'm 41, and most rap doesn't speak to me, doesn't move me whatsoever. But I do listen to it enough to know that lyrics Iverson's spewing on "Non-Fiction" are fairly common.

That doesn't mean people won't be offended, and legitimately so. Iverson's rap on gays, as reported earlier this week in the Philadelphia Inquirer: "Come to me with faggot tendencies/You'll be sleepin' where the maggots be." He also raps, "Man enough to pull a gun/Be man enough to squeeze it."

This is a young man who in the same breath will tell you he is a role model? Sadly, he is probably right on the mark. And sadly, the hip-hop community seems to get a pass on gay-bashing and misogynist behavior.

Given what this kid has been through in his life, and that the present environment existed long before he came along, many of

us have extended Iverson the benefit of the doubt. He's about used it up. It's not about his twisted lyrics, specifically. It's about squandering talent, it's about being a self-absorbed egomaniac whose position in the culture isn't nearly as big as he thinks it is. It's about never listening to anyone, and having no regard for anything that doesn't revolve around him and his. Kinda like the very dead Notorious B.I.G. and Tupac, which I'm sure Iverson would take as a compliment.

I thought Iverson was getting somewhere when he said earlier this week, "The whole time I've been in the NBA, I haven't been professional at all. I always looked at it like it was just basketball. This year will definitely be the best season I've had since I've been in the NBA. I owe it to myself and my family and my teammates to be a better player."

"I'm concentrating on basketball. I haven't been working on my game as serious as I should've. I have the raw talent. This is going to be the most important year of my career because all eyes are on me this year. Everybody's wanting to see if I can be the captain, if I can be a leader, if I can be professional besides playing basketball, and if I'm up to the challenge. I'm ready for it because it's something I can do."

But the longer you listen to Iverson, the more you realize he's disconnected from the world we live in, even the world he lives in. The attitude is: I can be late or miss practice whenever I want because I'm Allen Iverson, The Answer, and the team don't have nothin' if it ain't got me. And if you make a big deal out of me cussin' the coach and standing up my teammates and getting fined 50 times in one season, then you must be a punk 'cause I'm tough and you ain't.

Iverson is ticked off because the 76ers tried to trade him because he repeatedly is late to practice, if he shows at all. You know what his take is? "That's embarrassing to hear that an organization is thinking about trading its franchise player because he's tardy to practice."

Of course, it never occurred to him that it ought to be embarrassing for the franchise player to be tardy repeatedly. That wouldn't cross his mind. "You're going to send me to the worst team in the league?" he asked incredulous at the possibility of going to the Los Angeles Clippers, apparently unaware that players a whole lot more accomplished than he is (Wilt and Kareem to name two) were traded in their prime.

Truth be told, the Clippers don't want Iverson. Several teams have turned down the chance to trade for him and here's why: They're afraid he'll never get with the program—anybody's program. He plays his heart out every time he puts on a uniform. For those 48 minutes, there isn't anything he won't do to win a basketball game. He'll sacrifice his body, he'll do the dirty work some superstars don't want to do. But the great players in any sport know it only starts there. And that's what Iverson hasn't grasped. You know what he said this week about his repeated tardiness, which by the way has angered his teammates?

"Yeah, I was late to practice, but, believe me, [the number of] times that I heard nobody would put up with that. I'm not even brave enough to miss that many practices."

So how many, Allen? "I don't know; I wasn't counting. Don't nobody complain about the effort I give in a game. [Given the injuries and pounding he takes] it's bad enough I had to come to the game."

Iverson went on to say he was "hurt hearing some of the things the fans were saying,

some of the things people on the coaching staff were saying. I thought a lot of people in this organization were my friends and I found out the hard way that there's no friends in this business besides your teammates."

I guess those would be the teammates for whom he won't come to practice on time. I guess those would be the friends who have begged him for years to get his act together to try to realize there are obligations that come with an \$80 million contract. If they're not sucking up to him, they're against him, they don't understand him, they're not as tough as he is.

Folks under 30 are tired of people my age wanting Iverson to be Bird or Magic or Jordan, and that's understandable. Different time, different place, the world evolves. But I'm looking at Kevin Garnett now, at Ray Allen, at Tim Duncan, at Shaq and Kobe Bryant. There is a new generation of players trying to be all they can be. And they have fully developed lives outside of basketball.

Iverson, meanwhile, raps one thing, but his actions speak even louder. It's everybody else's fault, it's the coach's fault, it's the system's fault. He says he is going to change. It reminds me of Bob Knight saying he was going to change. I'm hoping Iverson is different because he's more than 30 years younger than Knight; he can grow up if he wants. But maybe it's more important for him to talk loud while saying nothing.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, again, let me urge the NBA and the Philadelphia 76ers to step forward and be heard. They will say: Look, we cannot control Mr. Iverson's conduct. That may be true. But they have an obligation, a responsibility to speak out and to condemn such conduct, even if they are unable to control it. So far, either they have, by silence, acquiesced, or they have to acknowledge that they find nothing wrong with the CD.

I find that both troubling and tragic if that is the standard we are to follow.

Again, the NBA, the Philadelphia 76ers, and their coach ought to speak out loud and clear and indicate this is not the kind of conduct they expect from one of their star athletes and to be as critical of it as I know Americans are in general.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I believe some of our other colleagues have reserved time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for sharing those serious concerns. It was not long ago that a group of us wrote the major department stores in the country asking them not to sell this violent material to minors, and they responded as good corporate citizens.

They said: We have a constitutional right to sell it, but we are not going to do it. Either we are not going to sell it at all, or we are going to make sure children produce an ID so we know they are old enough to buy the material. I thought that was a good corporate response.

Yes, the NBA may not legally be able to stop this stuff, but they ought to express their concern about it. The Sen-

ator makes a valid point, and I salute him for it.

(The remarks of Mr. SESSIONS pertaining to the introduction of S. 3169 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

#### ORGAN DONATION IN AMERICA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, before I address the issue that I would like to speak to this evening, I would first like to acknowledge a press conference which was held today, and one which I believe could have some significance across the United States. It was a press conference here on the lawn of the U.S. Capitol. In attendance were Senators BILL FRIST of Tennessee and Senator DEWINE of Ohio—both Republican Senators—as well as my Democratic colleague, Senator CARL LEVIN and I.

What would bring together two Democrats and two Republicans in rare agreement here in the close of a session? It is an issue which, frankly, transcends party and transcends region. It is the issue of organ donation in America.

Mr. President, 72,000 of our friends and neighbors are sitting by a telephone across America at this very moment waiting for the phone to ring to be told that there is an organ available to be donated to them which could save their lives—72,000. In my home State of Illinois, there are 4,500 such people. Sadly, 300 of them will die before they receive the phone call that an organ is available.

So last year I joined with Senators FRIST, DEWINE, LEVIN, and KENNEDY, and half a dozen other Senators from both sides of the aisle, to try to address this on a national basis. We came up with the concept that this Thanksgiving in the year 2000 will be designated "Give Thanks, Give Life Week," where we will try to alert families across America, as they come together for Thanksgiving, that they should take a few moments of time in that festivity and just perhaps talk to one another privately about their feelings about organ donation.

We were lucky to have the endorsement of this effort by the National Football League. At 17 different NFL games on Thanksgiving Week, they will have "Give Thanks, Give Life" activities.

Today, we had at this gathering on the Capitol lawn, Connie Payton, who is the widow of the great Chicago Bear running back Walter Payton. Of course, he died in November of last year from liver disease. He might have been saved by a liver transplant. She has really dedicated her life since trying to work for children and for organ donation in his memory.